

App. No.:10/707589  
Filed: December 23, 2003  
Conf. No.:1588

Page 3 of 3

### REMARKS

The claims have been amended rather extensively and several of them have been canceled to further emphasize applicant's invention over the cited art. In essence claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of original claim 4 and the remaining claims either have been canceled to avoid duplication.


In view of this it is believed necessary only initially to discuss the rejection of claim 4. This claim has been rejected on the combination of Andrey in view of Abukawa. It is most respectfully submitted that this combination is made in light of applicant's teaching rather than that of the prior art.

The Examiner has alleged that the art teaches that having both the pole teeth and the magnets having facing planar surfaces would reduce the cogging torque. It is believed that this is not true. For example Andrey shows in his FIGS. 16 and 18 two different embodiments each of which has only the facing surface of one or the other to have flat surfaces. Thus it must be assumed that he did not recognize that cogging would be reduced further by having both flat. Furthermore, it does not appear that he recognizes at all that the flattening of the surfaces will reduce cogging torque as he does not teach or claim this result from the flat shape.

Abukawa is also generally directed to reduce cogging and does show flattening of portions of the pole teeth in some embodiments, but he does this to change the gap distance in a circumferential direction. Flattening both magnets and pole teeth would not have this result, but rather the opposite to what he teaches.

Therefore it is submitted that the art relied upon teaches away from not toward the invention. Favorable reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Beutler  
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 721-1182  
Pacific Time